

Dynamics of chiral oscillations - A comparative analysis with spin-flipping

A. E. Bernardini† §

† Instituto de Física Gleb Wataghin, UNICAMP,
PO Box 6165, SP 13083-970, Campinas, SP, Brazil

Abstract. Chiral oscillation as well as spin flipping effects correspond to quantum phenomena of fundamental importance in the context of particle physics and, in particular, of neutrino physics. From the point of view of first quantized theories, we are specifically interested in appointing the differences between chirality and helicity by obtaining their dynamic equations for a *fermionic* Dirac-*type* particle (neutrino). We also identify both effects when the non-minimal coupling with an external (electro)magnetic field in the neutrino interacting Lagrangian is taken into account. We demonstrate that, however, there is no constraint between chiral oscillations, when it takes place in vacuum, and the process of spin flipping related to the helicity quantum number, which does not take place in vacuum. To conclude, we show that the origin of chiral oscillations (in vacuum) can be interpreted as position very rapid oscillation projections onto the longitudinal direction of momentum.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Cj, 03.65.Pm, 11.30.Rd, 14.60.Pq

1. Introduction

Over recent years, the properties of neutrinos [1, 2, 3] have become the subject of an increasing number of theoretical works upon quantum oscillation phenomena [4, 5]. The flavor mixing models [6, 7], the quantum field prescriptions [8, 10, 9] and, generically, the quantum mechanics of oscillation phenomena formalism [5, 13, 12, 10, 11] have been extensively studied. Notwithstanding the exceptional ferment in this field, the numerous conceptual difficulties hidden in the quantum oscillation phenomena represent an intriguing challenge for physicists. In the last three years, compelling experimental evidences have continuously ratified that neutrinos undergo flavor oscillations in vacuum or in matter. For instance, we refer to the outstanding results of the Super-Kamiokande atmospheric neutrino experiment [14], in which a significant up-down asymmetry of the high-energy muon events was observed, to the results of the SNO solar neutrino experiment [15, 16], in which a direct evidence for the transition of the solar electron neutrinos into other flavors was obtained, and also to the results of the KamLAND experiment [17] in confirming that the disappearance of solar electron neutrinos is mainly due to neutrino oscillations and not to other types of neutrino conversions [18, 19]. The experimental data could be completely interpreted and understood in terms of three flavor quantum numbers, excepting by the LSND anomaly [21, 20, 16] which permit us to speculate the existence of (at least) a fourth neutrino (flavor?) which has to be inert. In fact, the hypothesis of mixing between known neutrino species (electron, muon and tau) and higher mass neutrinos including sterile neutrinos was naively studied in the literature [22]. The neutrino spin-flipping attributed to some dynamic external [23] interacting process, which comes from the non-minimal coupling of a magnetic moment with an external electromagnetic field [24], was formerly supposed to be a relevant effect in the context of the solar-neutrino puzzle. As a consequence of a non-vanishing magnetic moment interacting with an external electromagnetic field, left-handed neutrinos could change their helicity (to right-handed)[27]. The effects on flavor oscillations due to external magnetic interactions in a kind of chirality-preserving phenomenon were also studied [28] but they lack of a full detailed theoretical analysis. We observe, however, that only for ultrarelativistic particles as neutrinos, changing helicity approximately means changing chirality. What we intend to demonstrate in this paper is that, in the context of oscillation phenomena and in the framework of a first quantized theory, the small differences between the concepts of chirality and helicity, which had been interpreted as representing the same physical quantities for massless particles [23, 24, 27, 28, 25], can be quantified for massive particles. We concentrate our discussion, however, on the aspects concerning with chiral oscillations. In the standard model flavor-changing interactions, neutrinos with positive chirality are decoupled from the neutrino absorbing charged weak currents [26]. Consequently, such positive chirality neutrinos become sterile with respect to weak interactions. Independently of any external electromagnetic field, since neutrinos are detected essentially via V-A weak charged currents, the chiral oscillation mechanism by itself may even explain the

“missing” LSND data. Despite the experimental circumstances not being completely favorable to such an interpretation, which should be an additional motivation to our theoretical calculations, the quantum transitions that produces a final flavor eigenstate corresponding to an active-sterile quantum mixing is perfectly acceptable from the theoretical point of view. In fact, a formalism with Dirac wave packets [29, 30] leads to the study of chiral oscillations [26]. Moreover, chiral coupled to flavor oscillations could lead to some small modifications to the standard flavor conversion formula [31]. Even focusing specifically on the chiral oscillation mechanism, we have also observed a generic interest in identifying the physical meaning of variables which coexist with the interference between positive and negative frequency solutions of Dirac equation [32, 33, 34, 35] in a Dirac wave packet treatment. If we follow an almost identical line of reasoning as that applied for rapid oscillations of the position, it is also possible to verify that the average value of the Dirac chiral operator γ^5 also presents an oscillating behavior.

Our aim is thus just to clarify some conceptual relations between helicity and chirality by constructing the dynamics of the processes of chiral oscillation and spin-flipping. The *differences* between the chirality (γ^5) and the helicity (h) dynamics for a neutrino non-minimally coupling with an external (electro)magnetic field are expressed in terms of the equation of the motion of the correspondent operators γ^5 and h . To be more clear, in order to determine the relevant physical observables and confront the dynamics of chiral oscillations with the dynamics of spin flipping in the presence of an external magnetic field, we report about a further class of static characteristics of neutrinos, namely, the (electro)magnetic moment which appears in a Lagrangian with non-minimal coupling. We shall demonstrate that the oscillating effects can be explained as an implication of the *zitterbewegung* phenomenon that emerges when the Dirac equation solution is used for describing the time evolution of a wave packet [30]. Due to this tenuous relation between *zitterbewegung* and chiral oscillations, the question to be answered in this manuscript concerns with the *immediate* description of chiral oscillations in terms of the *zitterbewegung* motion, i. e. we shall demonstrate in the following that, in fact, chiral oscillations are coupled with the *zitterbewegung* motion so that they cannot exist independently each other.

In order to make clear the confront of ideas involving chirality and helicity, as an introductory purpose, in section II, we recover such concepts and their common points at the same time we appoint their differences by assuming a Lagrangian with minimal or non-minimal coupling. In section III, we seek the *immediate* description of chiral oscillations in vacuum in terms of the trembling motion (*zitterbewegung*) described by the velocity (Dirac) operator α . We summarize this section with the interpretation of chiral oscillations as position very rapid oscillation projections onto a decomposed direction of the motion which is longitudinal to the momentum of the particle. We draw our conclusions in section IV.

2. Chirality and helicity

Let us firstly consider the time evolution of a spin one-half free particle given by the Dirac equation

$$(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m) \psi(x) = 0, \quad (1)$$

with the plane wave solutions given by $\psi(x) = \psi_+(x) + \psi_-(x)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_+(x) &= \exp[-i p x] u(p) \quad \text{for positive frequencies and} \\ \psi_-(x) &= \exp[+i p x] v(p) \quad \text{for negative frequencies,} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$x = (t, \mathbf{x})$, p is the relativistic *quadrivector*, $p = (E, \mathbf{p})$, and the relativistic energy is represented by $E^2 = m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2$. The free propagating mass-eigenstate spinors are written as [36]

$$\begin{aligned} u_s(p) &= \frac{\gamma^\mu p_\mu + m}{[2E(m+E)]^{\frac{1}{2}}} u_s(m, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{E+m}{2E}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta_s \\ \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{[2E(E+m)]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \eta_s \end{pmatrix}, \\ v_s(p) &= \frac{-\gamma^\mu p_\mu + m}{[2E(m+E)]^{\frac{1}{2}}} v_s(m, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{[2E(E+m)]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \eta_s \\ \left(\frac{E+m}{2E}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta_s \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\eta_{1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. By considering the gamma matrices (in the Dirac representation),

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^i \\ -\sigma^i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where σ^i are the Pauli matrices, we can observe the following γ^5 matrix properties,

$$(\gamma^5)^\dagger = \gamma^5, \quad (\gamma^5)^2 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \{\gamma^5, \gamma^\mu\} = 0, \quad (5)$$

which lead to the commuting relation $[\gamma^5, S^{\mu\nu}] = 0$, where $S^{\mu\nu}$ are the generators of the *continuous Lorentz transformations*. Forming out of Dirac field bilinears, it is convenient to define the *vector* and the *pseudo-vector* currents respectively by

$$j^\mu(x) = \bar{\psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \psi(x) \quad \text{and} \quad j^{\mu 5}(x) = \bar{\psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 \psi(x). \quad (6)$$

By assuming that $\psi(x)$ satisfies the free Dirac equation, we can compute the divergence of this current densities,

$$\partial_\mu j^\mu(x) = (\partial_\mu \bar{\psi}(x)) \gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu \psi(x)) = (i m \bar{\psi}(x)) \psi + \bar{\psi} (-i m \psi(x)) = 0 \quad (7)$$

which leads to the conservation of $j^\mu(x)$. When we couple the Dirac field to the electromagnetic field, $j^\mu(x)$ will become the electric current density. In a similar way, we can compute

$$\partial_\mu j^{\mu 5}(x) = 2 i m \bar{\psi}(x) \gamma^5 \psi(x). \quad (8)$$

If $m = 0$, this current, often called the *axial vector current*, is also conserved. In general, it is useful to define the chiral *left-L* (negative chiral) and *right-R* (positive chiral) currents through the combinations of the operator γ^5 by

$$j_L^\mu(x) = \bar{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\frac{1-\gamma^5}{2}\psi(x) \quad \text{and} \quad j_R^\mu(x) = \bar{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\frac{1+\gamma^5}{2}\psi(x). \quad (9)$$

Just when $m = 0$, these are respectively the electric current densities of *left* and *right-handed* particles and they are separately conserved. The two currents $j^\mu(x)$ and $j^{\mu 5}(x)$ are the Noether currents corresponding to the two gauge transformations respectively represented by

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow \exp[i\alpha]\psi(x) \quad (10)$$

and

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow \exp[i\alpha\gamma^5]\psi(x). \quad (11)$$

The former one is a symmetry of the Dirac Lagrangian. The later one, called *chiral transformation*, is a symmetry of the kinetic part of the Dirac Lagrangian [36]. The Noether theorem confirms that an *axial vector current* related to a *chiral transformation* is conserved only if $m = 0$.

In parallel, we can define the operator $h = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}$, so that, by conveniently choosing the two component spinors η_s , the spinors $u_s(p)$ and $v_s(p)$ become eigenstates of h with eigenvalues $h = +\frac{1}{2}$ for $s = 1$ and $h = -\frac{1}{2}$ for $s = 2$ ($\hbar = c = 1$). Although the free-particle plane wave solutions can always be chosen to be eigenfunctions of h , it is not possible to find solutions which are eigenfunctions of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ with an arbitrary unitary vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$. It occurs because the operator $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ does not commute with the free particle Hamiltonian unless $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}} = \pm\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}$ or $\boldsymbol{p} = 0$. The operator h that can be diagonalized simultaneously with the free particle Hamiltonian is called the *helicity* operator [37]. It is exactly the particle spin projection onto the momentum direction. The particle with $h = +\frac{1}{2}$ is called *right-handed* and that one with $h = -\frac{1}{2}$ is called *left-handed*. The helicity of a massive particle depends on the reference frame, since one can always *boost* to a frame in which its momentum is in the opposite direction (but its spin is unchanged). For a massless particle, which travels at speed of light, it is not possible to perform such a *boost*. In certain way, helicity and chirality quantum numbers carry a kind of complementary information. In vacuum, the chirality is invariant under a *continuous Lorentz transformation* but it is not constant in time if the particle is massive. The helicity is constant in time but it is not Lorentz invariant. A chiral eigenstate can always be a linear combination of two helicity eigenstate.

By turning back to the central point of our manuscript where we intend to compare the dynamic processes of chiral oscillation and spin flipping, let us analyze the possibilities of observing them via Lagrangian interacting terms. Initially, we can construct a gauge invariant Lagrangian in a theory with initially massless fermions. We can couple a Dirac fermion to a gauge field by assigning the chiral-*L* fields $\psi_{i_L}(x)$ to one

representation of a gauge group G and assigning the chiral- R fields $\psi_{i_R}(x)$ to a different representation. Thus we can write

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(x) \left[\partial_\mu - ig A_\mu^a(x) T^a \left(\frac{1 - \gamma^5}{2} \right) \right] \psi(x), \quad (12)$$

where it is evident that only negative chiral fields couple with gauge boson fields $A_\mu^a(x)$. It is straightforward to verify that the Lagrangian (12) is invariant to the following infinitesimal ($\alpha^a(x)$) local gauge transformation [36]

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &\rightarrow \left[1 + i\alpha_\mu^a(x) T^a \left(\frac{1 - \gamma^5}{2} \right) \right] \psi(x), \\ A_\mu^a(x) &\rightarrow A_\mu^a(x) + g^{-1} \partial_\mu \alpha^a(x) + f^{abc} A_\mu^b(x) \alpha^c(x), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the corresponding algebra properties are given by the commuting relations of operators T^a ,

$$[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c. \quad (14)$$

Since the chiral- R fields are free fields, we can even eliminate these fields and write a gauge invariant Lagrangian for purely chiral- L fermions. The idea of gauge fields that couple only to chiral- L fermions plays a central role in the construction of the theory of weak interactions. To work out the general properties of chirally coupled fermions, it is useful to rewrite their Lagrangian with one further transformation. Let us take the charge conjugate operator $C = i\gamma^2\gamma^0$ in order to write a charge conjugate field ψ^c as

$$\psi^c = C\bar{\psi}^T = i\gamma^2\psi^* \quad (15)$$

so that the conjugate chiral- R component of a field ψ , which would be given by ψ_L^c , transforms as a chiral- L quantity under a continuous Lorentz transformation, i. e.

$$\psi_L^c = (\psi^c)_L = i \left(\frac{1 - \gamma^5}{2} \right) \gamma^2 \psi^* = i\gamma^2 \left(\frac{1 + \gamma^5}{2} \right) \psi^* = i\gamma^2 \psi_R^*, \quad (16)$$

and, in the same way, the conjugate chiral- L component of a field ψ , which would be given by ψ_R^c , transforms as a chiral- R quantity, i. e.

$$\psi_R^c = i\gamma^2 \psi_L^*, \quad (17)$$

where, for simplicity, we have omitted the x dependence. This property is important for observing what occurs in a gauge model with L - R symmetry [38, 39]. In this class of models, chiral- R neutrinos appear as interacting particles coupling with vector gauge bosons described by the generators of the algebra related to a symmetry which brings the unification group properties. Meanwhile, due to the vectorial characteristic of the interactions which are mediated by vector gauge bosons, the possibility of a left to right (or vice-versa) chiral conversion via gauge coupling is impossible. As we can observe in the following, the probability amplitude for a vector coupling between fields with opposite chiral quantum numbers is null,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\psi}_L A_\mu \gamma^\mu \psi_L &\equiv \bar{\psi}_R A_\mu \gamma^\mu \psi_L \propto ((1 + \gamma^5)\psi)^\dagger \gamma^0 A_\mu \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5)\psi \\ &= \psi^\dagger (1 + \gamma^5) \gamma^0 A_\mu \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5)\psi \\ &= \psi^\dagger \gamma^0 A_\mu \gamma^\mu (1 + \gamma^5)(1 - \gamma^5)\psi = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which forbids the possibility of chiral changes (oscillations) in this way. Alternatively, we cannot abandon the idea of spin-inversion which does *not* correspond to chiral conversion but is a very well established mechanism which emerges via an external vector field interaction.

2.1. Chirality and helicity dynamics for massive neutrinos in the presence of an external magnetic field

In the minimal standard model, neutrinos are massless and thus have no magnetic moment. This is due to the fact that the magnetic moment μ is defined as a coefficient of the coupling between a fermionic field $\psi(x)$ and the electromagnetic field $F^{\mu\nu}(x)$ given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \mu \bar{\psi}(x) \sigma_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}(x) \psi(x) + h.c. \quad (19)$$

that is an effective low-energy interaction, for masses and energies well below the W^\pm mass where $\sigma_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2}[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$ and $F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A^\nu(x) - \partial^\nu A^\mu(x)$. In a minimal extension of the standard model in which somehow neutrinos become massive Dirac particles, leaving the rest of the model unchanged, the neutrino magnetic moment arises at the one-loop level, as does the weak contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of a charge lepton [29]. The value of μ can be read off from general formulas for the electromagnetic vertex, to one-loop order, of an arbitrary fermion (ℓ). To leading order in m_ℓ^2/m_W^2 , the results are independent of m_ℓ and of the mixing matrix so that it turns out to be proportional to the neutrino mass,

$$\mu = \frac{3eG}{8\sqrt{2}\pi^2} m = \frac{3m_e G}{4\sqrt{2}\pi^2} \mu_B m_\nu = 2.7 \times 10^{-10} \mu_B \frac{m_\nu}{m_N} \quad (20)$$

where G is the Fermi constant and m_N is the nucleon mass. By principle, for $m_\nu \approx 1$ eV, the magnetic moment introduced by this formula is exceedingly small to be detected or to affect astrophysical or physical processes.

We have not discriminated the flavor/mass mixing elements in the coupling described above because we are initially interested just in the physical observable dynamics ruled by the effective Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta \left[m - \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu \sigma_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}(x) + h.c. \right) \right] \\ &= \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta [m - \text{Re}(\mu) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}(x) + \text{Im}(\mu) \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{E}(x)], \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \alpha_k \hat{k} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \gamma_0 \gamma_k \hat{k}$, $\beta = \gamma_0$, $\mathbf{B}(x)$ and $\mathbf{E}(x)$ are respectively the magnetic and electric fields. We have also assumed that H represents the time evolution operator for times subsequent to the creation of a spinor w ($t = 0$). The real (imaginary) part of μ represents the magnetic (electric) dipole moment of the mass eigenstate represented by $\psi(x)$. But it can be demonstrated [25] that, for Dirac neutrinos, the electric moment must vanish unless CP is violated, and, for Majorana neutrinos, the electric moment vanishes if CPT invariance is assumed.

Turning back to our main assertions, the problem to be solved concerns with the *immediate* description of chiral oscillations and spin flipping in terms of the Hamiltonian (21) dynamics by recurring to the Heisenberg equation of motion [37],

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle = i\langle[H, \mathcal{O}]\rangle + \left\langle\frac{\partial\mathcal{O}}{\partial t}\right\rangle, \quad (22)$$

which show us how to easily determine whether or not a given observable \mathcal{O} is a constant of the motion. By means of very simple calculations, we notice, for instance, that the free propagating particle momentum is not a conserved quantity for the above Hamiltonian (21),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle = Re(\mu)\langle\beta\nabla(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\cdot\mathbf{B}(x))\rangle. \quad (23)$$

In the same way, the particle velocity given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle = i\langle[H, \mathbf{x}]\rangle = \langle\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle \quad (24)$$

comes out as a non-null value. After solving the $\mathbf{x}(t)(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t))$ differential equation, it is possible to observe that the fermionic particle executes very rapid oscillations in addition to a uniform motion. This quivering motion is known as *zitterbewegung* [37]. By following an almost identical line of reasoning as that applied for rapid oscillations of the position, it is possible to verify that the average value of the Dirac chiral operator γ^5 also presents an oscillating behavior. By newly recurring to the Heisenberg equation (22), it is possible to obtain the chirality and the helicity dynamics respectively as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\gamma^5\rangle = 2i\langle\gamma_0\gamma_5[m - Re(\mu)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\cdot\mathbf{B}(x)]\rangle \quad (25)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle h\rangle = \frac{1}{2}Re(\mu)\langle\gamma_0[(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\cdot\mathbf{B}(x)) + 2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\times\mathbf{B}(x))\cdot\mathbf{p}]\rangle \quad (26)$$

where we have alternatively redefined the particle helicity as the projection of the spin angular momentum onto the vector momentum, $h = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\cdot\mathbf{p}$ (with \mathbf{p} in place of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$). Therefore, we remark that, if a neutrino has an intrinsic magnetic moment and passes through a region filled by an external magnetic field, the neutrino helicity can flip in a completely different way from how chiral oscillations take place. The Eqs. (25-26) can be reduced to the non-interacting case by setting $\mathbf{B}(x) = 0$. In this case,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle h\rangle = i\langle[H, h]\rangle = -\langle(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\times\mathbf{p})\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle = 0 \quad (27)$$

and, in the same way, the chiral operator γ^5 is *not* a constant of the motion [26] since

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\gamma^5\rangle = i\langle[H, \gamma^5]\rangle = 2im\langle\gamma^0\gamma^5\rangle. \quad (28)$$

The effective value of Eq. (26) appears only when both positive and negative frequencies are taken into account to compose a Dirac wave packet, i. e. the non-null averaged value of $\langle\gamma_0\gamma_5\rangle$ is revealed by the interference between Dirac equation solutions with opposite sign frequencies. In fact, in order to quantify neutrino chiral oscillations in vacuum,

we could report to the Dirac wave packet formalism [31] where the general procedure consists in writing the general (complete) Dirac equation (wave packet) solution of Eq. (2) as

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{s=1,2} \{b_s(p)u_s(p) \exp[-iEt] + d_s^*(\tilde{p})v_s(\tilde{p}) \exp[+iEt]\} \exp[i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}] \quad (29)$$

where $\bar{u}(p)$ (or $\bar{v}(p)$) is defined by $\bar{u}(p) = u^\dagger(p)\gamma^0$ (or $\bar{v}(p) = v^\dagger(p)\gamma^0$) and $\tilde{p} = (E, -\mathbf{p})$. By fixing the initial condition over $\psi(0, \mathbf{x})$ as the Fourier transform of the weight function

$$\varphi(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_0) w = \sum_{s=1,2} \{b_s(p)u_s(p) + d_s^*(\tilde{p})v_s(\tilde{p})\} \quad (30)$$

we get

$$\psi(0, \mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \varphi(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_0) \exp[i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}] w \quad (31)$$

where w is some fixed normalized spinor. The coefficients $b_s(p)$ and $d_s^*(\tilde{p})$ can thus be calculated by using the orthogonality properties of Dirac spinors. These coefficients carry an important physical information. For *any* initial state $\psi(0, \mathbf{x})$ given by Eq. (31), the negative frequency solution coefficient $d_s^*(\tilde{p})$ necessarily provides a non-null contribution to the time evolving wave packet. This obliges us to take the complete set of Dirac equation solutions to construct the wave packet. Only if we consider a momentum distribution given by a delta function (plane wave limit) and suppose an initial spinor w being a positive energy mass-eigenstate with momentum \mathbf{p} , the contribution due to the negative frequency solutions $d_s^*(\tilde{p})$ will become null.

By following a similar procedure, we could also calculate the averaged values which appear in Eqs. (25-26). But we would have to be careful when calculating the exact Hamiltonian eigenstates and eigenvalues in order to construct an accurate superposition of states which necessarily respect the orthonormality relations and represent a complete set of solutions. This point does not necessarily correspond to a problem with trivial solutions, however, in a first analysis, as a suggestion, one could ignore the space-temporal analytic characteristics of the external magnetic field \mathbf{B} and assume the simplifying hypothesis where \mathbf{B} is a uniform magnetic field so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \gamma^5 \rangle = 2i \langle \gamma_0 \gamma_5 [m - Re(\mu) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}] \rangle. \quad (32)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle h \rangle = Re(\mu) \langle \gamma_0 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \times \mathbf{B}) \cdot \mathbf{p} \rangle. \quad (33)$$

and thus proceed with the calculations.

Effectively the above discussion represents the first step for accurately deriving the expression for the neutrino spin-flipping in magnetic field which can be related to chiral oscillations in the limit of a massless particle (ultra-relativistic limit). By correctly differing the concepts of helicity and chirality, we can determine the origin and the influence of chiral oscillations and spin-flipping in the complete flavor conversion formula.

In some previous manuscripts [11, 30, 31] we have confirmed that the *fermionic* character of the particles modify the standard oscillation probability which is previously obtained by implicitly assuming a *scalar* nature of the mass-eigenstates. Strictly speaking, we have obtained the term of very high oscillation frequency depending on the sum of energies in the new oscillation probability formula which, in case of Dirac wave-packets, represents modifications that introduce correction factors which, under the current experimental point of view, are not effective in the UR limit of propagating neutrinos in vacuum but which deserves, at least, a careful investigation for neutrino moving in the background matter where spin/chiral effects become more relevant [25, 40, 41]. The physical consequences in environments such as supernova can be theoretically studied [42]. For instance, it was observed that neutrinos propagating in matter achieve an effective electromagnetic vertex which affects the flavor conversion process in a framework where preserving chirality can be established [28].

Finally, just as a remark, it is also to be noted that in this kind of analysis we have to assume that neutrinos are Dirac particles, thus making the positive-chiral component sterile. If neutrinos are Majorana particles, they cannot have a magnetic moment, obviating the spin-flipping via magnetic field interactions but still allowing the (vacuum) chiral conversion possibility via very rapid oscillations (*zitterbewegung*) as we shall present in the next section.

3. Chiral oscillations coupled with the *zitterbewegung* motion

As we have observed in the previous section, if a massless particle represented by a Dirac spinor is produced in a chiral (γ^5) eigenstate, its chirality is a constant of the motion in addition to being Lorentz invariant. Otherwise, independently of the existence of external interacting fields, these properties no longer hold for Dirac particles with mass. In vacuum, chiral oscillations can be formally constructed in terms of the *zitterbewegung* motion. In spite of being done with simple mathematical manipulations, we believe it is important in the large context of quantum oscillation phenomena. From Eq. (22), we can easily verify that the free propagating particle momentum is a conserved quantity, and that the particle velocity given by Eq.(24) comes out as a non-null value. At first sight the Eq.(24) appears quite reasonable [37] when we calculate the positive frequency solution ($\psi_+(x)$) averaged value

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle_+(t) = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \psi_+^\dagger(x) \boldsymbol{\alpha} \psi_+(x) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\mathbf{p}}{E} \sum_{s=1,2} |b_s(\mathbf{p})|^2 \quad (34)$$

which represents exactly the averaged value of the relativistic velocity $\frac{\mathbf{p}}{E}$. Note, however, that the eigenvalue of α_k is ± 1 and corresponds to $\pm c$, but we know that, for massive particles, the classical velocity cannot be equal to $\pm c$. Moreover, once α_k and α_l do not commute when $k \neq l$, the measurement of the x -component of the velocity is incompatible with the measurement of the y -component of the velocity. This may appear unusual since we know that p_x and p_y commute. In spite of this peculiarities, there is no contradiction with such results since the plane wave solutions (3) which are

momentum and energy eigenfunctions are not eigenfunctions of α_k . The velocity related to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$ does not represent a constant of the motion since

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle = i\langle[H_0, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)]\rangle = 2i(\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle - \langle\boldsymbol{\alpha}H_0\rangle) \quad (35)$$

which can be regarded as a differential equation for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$. Keeping in mind that \mathbf{p} and H_0 are constants of the motion, we can easily solve the Eq. (35) and obtain [37]

$$\langle\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle(t) = \langle\mathbf{p}H_0^{-1}\rangle + \langle(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(0) - \mathbf{p}H_0^{-1})\exp[-2iH_0t]\rangle \quad (36)$$

By following the same procedure, we have already demonstrated in the previous section that the particle *helicity* $h = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is a constant of the motion and that the chiral operator γ^5 does not represent a constant of the motion. At time $t = 0$, the coefficients $b_s(p)$ and $d_s^*(p)$ used in the construction of the Dirac wave packet $\psi(x)$ can be chosen to provide a negative (positive) chirality eigenstate [31, 11] or, in the same way, to provide a helicity eigenstate (when $hu_s(p)(v_s(p)) \equiv \pm\frac{1}{2}u_s(p)(v_s(p))$). Once we have assumed that the initial chiral eigenstate $\|\psi(0, \mathbf{x})$ is not only a superposition of momentum eigenstates weighted by a momentum distribution of Eq. (30) centered around $\vec{\mathbf{p}}_0$, but also a helicity (constant of the motion) eigenstate obtained through the production of a spin-polarized particle, which formally occurs when we assume that the constant spinor w in the wave packet expression (31) is a simultaneous eigenspinor of γ^5 and $h\boldsymbol{\mathbb{1}}$, we can make use of the following decomposition,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\langle\gamma_5\rangle(t) &= \frac{d}{dt}\langle\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}})\rangle(t) \\ &= \left(\frac{d}{dt}\langle\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle(t)\right)\langle\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle(t) + \langle\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle(t)\left(\frac{d}{dt}\langle\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle(t)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and, observing that the helicity h and the momentum $\vec{\mathbf{p}}_0$ are constants of the motion, we can establish a subtle relation between the chirality operator $\gamma_5(t)$ and the velocity operator $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$ expressed in terms of

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\langle\gamma_5\rangle(t)\right) = (2h)\left(\frac{d}{dt}\langle\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle(t)\right) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}. \quad (38)$$

The time evolution of γ_5 presents an oscillating character which can be interpreted as a direct and natural consequence of the oscillating character of the trembling motion

\parallel Neutrinos are supposedly produced as chiral eigenstates via weak interactions.

$\boldsymbol{\mathbb{1}}$ When we establish that $\psi(0, \mathbf{x})$ is a h and/or a γ^5 eigenstate, we are referring to the choice of the fixed spinor w in Eq. (31). The *breaking* of the Lorentz symmetry is not specifically related to the choice of w , but more generically to the choice of the momentum distributions $b_s(p)$ and $d_s^*(\vec{p})$ written in terms of w and $\varphi(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_0)$. It is not the choice of w as a h eigenstate which ruins the Lorentz invariance of Dirac wave packets, but the general choice of the momentum distribution for constructing them and the effective way that they (Dirac wave packets) appear in some averaged value integrals, i. e. once one has established an analytical shape for the momentum distribution (as they have done in [26] and [29]), it is stated that it is valid only for one specific reference frame, and the discussion of Lorentz invariance aspects becomes a little more complicated since it touches more fundamental definitions.

described in terms of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$. The coupling of Eqs. (35) and (38) leads to the following explicit dependence of $\langle \gamma_5 \rangle(t)$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \gamma_5 \rangle(t) = 4 i h (\mathbf{p} - \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) H_0 \rangle) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}. \quad (39)$$

Since $\langle h \rangle$, \mathbf{p} and H_0 are constants of the motion, we conclude that there will not be chiral oscillations without the ‘‘quivering motion’’ of the position. The constraint between the chirality operator $\gamma_5(t)$ and the velocity operator $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$ becomes more interesting when we take into account the complete expression for the current density $\bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu\psi(x)$ (which leads to the average value of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$) and apply the *Gordon decomposition* [36],

$$\bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu\psi(x) = -\frac{i}{2m} \left[(\partial^\mu \bar{\psi}(x)) \psi(x) - \bar{\psi}(x) (\partial^\mu \psi(x)) \right] + \frac{1}{2m} \partial^\nu (\bar{\psi}(x) \sigma_{\mu\nu} \psi(x)), \quad (40)$$

where $\sigma_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2} [\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$. The spatial integration of the vector components of Eq. (40) gives us

$$\int d^3\mathbf{x} \psi^\dagger \boldsymbol{\alpha} \psi = \frac{1}{2m} \int d^3\mathbf{x} \left\{ -i [\bar{\psi} (\boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi) - (\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bar{\psi}) \psi] + [\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times (\bar{\psi} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \psi) - i \partial_t (\bar{\psi} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \psi)] \right\}, \quad (41)$$

where we have suppressed the x dependence. By using the Dirac equation solution expressed by (29) we can write the decomposed components of $\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle$ as

$$\int d^3\mathbf{x} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times (\bar{\psi} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \psi) = 0, \quad (42)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i}{2m} \int d^3\mathbf{x} [\bar{\psi} (\boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi) - (\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bar{\psi}) \psi] &= \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{p}}{E} \sum_{s=1,2} [|b_s(p)|^2 + |d_s(p)|^2] \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{s=1,2} \left(\frac{m}{E} - \frac{E}{m} \right) a_s \hat{\mathbf{p}} [b_s^*(p) d_s^*(\tilde{p}) \exp [+2 i E t] - d_s(p) b_s(\tilde{p}) \exp [-2 i E t]] \right\}, \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{p} = (E, -\mathbf{p})$ and where we have assumed that $a_s = \eta_{s'} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \eta_s = (-1)^{s+1} \delta_{ss'}$. Finally, the last term is written as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{i}{2m} \int d^3\mathbf{x} \partial_t (\bar{\psi} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \psi) &= \\ \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \sum_{s=1,2} \left(\frac{E}{m} \right) a_s \hat{\mathbf{p}} [b_s^*(p) d_s^*(\tilde{p}) \exp [+2 i E t] - d_s(p) b_s(\tilde{p}) \exp [-2 i E t]] \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{s \neq s'} \hat{\mathbf{n}}_s [b_s^*(p) d_{s'}^*(\tilde{p}) \exp [+2 i E t] - d_s(p) b_{s'}(\tilde{p}) \exp [-2 i E t]] \right\}, \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{1(2)} = \hat{1} \pm i\hat{2}$ when $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \hat{3}$ with $\hat{1}$, $\hat{2}$ and $\hat{3}$ corresponding to arbitrary mutually orthogonal directions.

The Eq. (42) allows us to reach the conclusion that the *zitterbewegung* does not get a contribution from the intrinsic spin dependent ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$) magnetic moment component which couples with external magnetic fields $\mathbf{B}(x)$. In fact, the *zitterbewegung* originates from the current strictly related to the internal electric moment. By taking into account the (momentum direction components of the) Eqs. (43-44), we can turn back to the Eq. (39), which carries the main idea of this manuscript, and observe that chiral oscillations can be

essentially constructed in terms of the longitudinal components of $\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle$. By calculating the mean value of $\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha} H \rangle$ and projecting it onto the momentum direction $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) H_0 \rangle \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{p}} &= \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \frac{\boldsymbol{p}}{E} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{p}} \sum_{s=1,2} [(E)|b_s(p)|^2 + (E)|d_s(p)|^2] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{s=1,2} \frac{m}{E} a_s [(E)b_s^*(p) d_s^*(\bar{p}) \exp[+2iEt] - (E)d_s(p) b_s(\bar{p}) \exp[-2iEt]] \right\} \\ &= |\boldsymbol{p}| - \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} m \sum_{s=1,2} a_s [b_s^*(p) d_s^*(\bar{p}) \exp[+2iEt] - d_s(p) b_s(\bar{p}) \exp[-2iEt]], \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

which can be substituted in (39) in order to give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \gamma_5 \rangle(t) &= \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m}{E} \sum_{s=1,2} (2ha_s)(2iE) [b_s^*(p) d_s^*(\bar{p}) \exp[+2iEt] \\ &\quad - d_s(p) b_s(\bar{p}) \exp[-2iEt]], \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

so that the time evolution of the chirality operator can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \gamma_5 \rangle(t) &= \langle \gamma_5 \rangle(0) + \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m}{E} \sum_{s=1,2} (2ha_s) [d_s(p) b_s(\bar{p}) (\exp[2iEt] - 1) + h.c.] \\ &= \langle \gamma_5 \rangle(0) + \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m}{E} \sum_{s=1,2} [d_s(p) b_s(\bar{p}) (\exp[2iEt] - 1) + h.c.] \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

since $2ha_s$ is equal to one for well defined spin up or spin down (helicity) states.

The physical significance of the above results is discussed in a very subtle way in [26]. They demonstrated that, for a gaussian initial wave function and if the initial state has average chirality zero, the oscillations of the *left-right* (L-R) chiralities cancel and there is again no overall oscillation. It could be the origin of an apparent paradox. In order to reproduce the ideas presented in [26] we observe that for any mass-eigenstate represented by plane wave solutions of the Dirac equation with mass, the rest-frame wave function is always an equal mixture of both chiralities. This is easily verified when

$$\psi = \frac{1 - \gamma^5}{2} \psi + \frac{1 + \gamma^5}{2} \psi = \psi_L + \psi_R, \quad (48)$$

where $\psi_{L,R}$ correspond respectively to chirality quantum numbers ∓ 1 . It could be shown that, in the rest frame of a particle, we have

$$|\psi_L|^2 = |\psi_R|^2. \quad (49)$$

Note that this result is not Lorentz invariant since a Lorentz *boost* is not a unitary transformation. Thus, while the cross section is Lorentz invariant the chiral probabilities are not. This seems to suggest that probabilities measurements are chiral independent. We seem to have an argument against the physical significance of chiral oscillations. The reply to this objection based upon the Lorentz invariance is simply that in any given Lorentz frame chiral oscillations are manifestly important because of the chiral projection form (V-A) of the charged weak currents. The chiral probability variations produced by Lorentz transformations (even if γ^5 commutes with the Lorentz generators)

are automatically compensated by the wave function normalization conditions⁺ and the Lorentz transformations of the intermediate vector bosons and other participating particles.

To summarize, in spite of also being possible to determine the explicit form of the helicity $\langle h \rangle(t)$, as we have done for $\langle \gamma_5 \rangle(t)$, in the context of electroweak interactions, it is not physically relevant since we have previously appointed that the helicity is not a Lorentz invariant variable. Moreover, the electroweak interactions have defined the negative chirality state as an interacting state. The same is not true for the helicity quantum number (spin projection quantum number). Under the phenomenological point of view, it is important to observe that chiral oscillations as well as spin-flipping can independently take place in coupling with a third physical process, for instance, the flavor conversion of a propagating neutrino.

4. Conclusions

In this brief study, we have discussed the concepts of chirality and helicity quantum numbers which appear when we construct the interacting Lagrangian of the electroweak theory. The effects of chiral oscillations were explained as a consequence of the *zitterbewegung* effect which emerges when Dirac equation solutions are used for describing the space-temporal evolution of a wave packet. In particular, we seek the *immediate* description of chiral oscillations in terms of the trembling motion described by the velocity (Dirac) operator α . By taking into account the complete set of Dirac equation solutions which results in a free propagating Dirac wave packet composed by positive and negative frequency components, we report about the well-established *zitterbewegung* results and indicate how chiral oscillations can be given in terms of the already know quantum oscillating variables. We have also interpreted chiral oscillations as position very rapid oscillation projections onto longitudinal (momentum) decomposed direction. By comparing the dynamic characteristics of chiral oscillations with the process of spin flipping which is related to the quantum number of helicity, we also have noticed that there is not a constraint between both phenomena in th sense that they are described by different dynamic evolution equations.

The clear understanding of the independent characteristics of the process of chiral oscillations and spin-flipping is important for several extensions of the quantum oscillation phenomena. Once we have assumed the electroweak interactions at the source and detector are (*left*) chiral $(\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma^5)\psi W_\mu)$ only the component with negative chirality contributes to the propagation. In this case, chiral coupled to flavor oscillations could lead to some small modifications to the standard flavor conversion formula [31]. We remind that, in the standard treatment of vacuum neutrino oscillations, the use of scalar mass-eigenstate wave packets made up exclusively of positive frequency plane-wave solutions is usually implicitly assumed. Although the standard oscillation formula could give the correct result when *properly* interpreted, a satisfactory description of fermionic

⁺ In fact, the analytical form of localization is not frame independent.

(spin one-half) particles requires the use of the Dirac equation as evolution equation for the mass-eigenstates. Consequently, the the spinorial form and the interference between positive and negative frequency components of the mass-eigenstate wave packets could lead to the possibility of chiral coupled with flavor oscillations which effectively introduce some small modifications to the *standard* flavor conversion formula [30] when it is applied to the study of non-relativistic neutrinos.

Our future perspectives concern with deriving the flavor coupled with chiral conversion expressions for neutrinos moving in the background matter by supposing that the magnitude of some experimentally (implicitly) observable matter effect could be quantified (and eventually detected). We know, however, the necessity of a more sophisticated approach is understood. In fact, the derivation of the oscillation formula should resort to field-theoretical methods which, meanwhile, are not very popular. They are thought to be very complicated and the existing quantum field computations of the oscillation formula do not agree in all respects [5]. The Blasone and Vitiello (BV) model [8, 9] to neutrino/particle mixing and oscillations seems to be the most distinguished trying to this aim. They have attempt to define a Fock space of weak eigenstates and to derive a nonperturbative oscillation formula. Flavor creation and annihilation operators, satisfying canonical (anti)comutation relations, are defined by means of Bogoliubov transformations. As a result, new oscillation formulas are obtained for fermions and bosons, with the oscillation frequency depending not only on the difference but also on the sum of the energies of the different mass eigenstates . In the particular framework of Dirac wave-packets, before aggregating the chiral oscillation effects, the flavor conversion formula can be reproduced [30] with the same mathematical structure as those obtained in the BV model [8, 9]. Moreover each new effect present in the oscillation formula can be separately quantified. The quantization of chiral oscillations in the framework of a quantum field theory can be eventually cogitated as a next step.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks FAPESP (PD 04/13770-0) for Financial Support.

References

- [1] Zuber K 1998 *Phys. Rep.* **305** 295
- [2] Scholberg K 2003 *Preprint* hep-ex/0308011
- [3] Alberico W M and Bilenky S M 2004 *Prog. Part. Nucl.* **35** 297
- [4] Zralek M 1998 *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **29** 3925
- [5] Beuthe M 2003 *Phys. Rep.* **375** 105
- [6] Gonzalez-Garcia M C and Nir Y 2003 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75** 245
- [7] de Gouvea A 2005 *Preprint* hep-ph/0503086
- [8] Blasone M and Vitiello G 1995 *Ann. Phys.* **244** 283
- [9] Blasone M, Pacheco P P and Tseung H W 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **67** 073011
- [10] Giunti C 2002 *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP0211(2002)017
- [11] Bernardini A E and De Leo S 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 076008
- [12] Giunti C and Kim C W 1998 *Phys. Rev. D* **58** 017301

- [13] McKeown R D and Vogel P 2004 *Phys. Rep.* **395** 315
- [14] A series of papers on Super-Kamiokande data about atmospheric neutrino fluxes, “*Superkamiokande Collaboration*”,
Fukuda S *et al.* 2002 *Phys. Lett. B* **537** 179
Fukuda S *et al.* 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 5651
Fukuda S *et al.* 2000 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 3999
- [15] A series of papers on SNO data about solar neutrino oscillation, “*SNO Collaboration*”,
Ahmad Q R *et al.* 2002 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** 011302
Ahmad Q R *et al.* 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** 011301
Ahmad Q R *et al.* 2000 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** 071301
- [16] Bandyopadhyay A *et al.* 2004 *Phys. Lett. B* **583** 134
- [17] Egushi K *et al.* 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 021802
- [18] Guzzo M *et al.* 2002 *Nucl. Phys. B* **629** 479
- [19] Barranco J *et al.* 2002 *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 093009
- [20] Aguilar A *et al.* 2001 *Phys. Rev. D* **64** 112007
- [21] Athanassopoulos C *et al.* 1998 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** 1774
- [22] Gell-Mann M, Ramond P and Slansky R 1979 in *Complex Spinors And Unified Theories in Supergravity* (Amsterdam: North Holland)
- [23] D’Olivo J C, Nieves J F and Pal P B 1990 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** 1088
- [24] Voloshin M B, Vysotskii M I and Okun L B 1986 *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **91** 754
- [25] Kim C W and Pevsner A 1993 *Neutrinos in Physics and Astrophysics* (Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers).
- [26] De Leo S and Rotelli P 1998 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **37** 2193
- [27] Barenboim G, Bernabu J and Vives O 1996 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** 3299
- [28] D’Olivo J C and Nieves J F 1996 *Phys. Lett. B* **383** 87
- [29] Itzykson C and Zuber J B 1980 *Quantum Field Theory* (New York: Mc Graw-Hill Inc.)
- [30] Bernardini A E and De Leo S 2004 *Eur. Phys. J. C* **37** 471
- [31] Bernardini A E and De Leo S 2005 *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **20** 681
- [32] Braun J W, Su Q and Grobe R 1999 *Phys. Rev. A* **59** 604
- [33] Rupp S, Sigg T and Sorg M 2000 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **39** 1543
- [34] Thaller B 2004 *Preprint* quant-ph/0409079
- [35] Bolte J and Glaser R 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** 6359
- [36] Peskin M E and Schroeder D V 1995 *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (New York: Addison - Wesley Publishing Company)
- [37] Sakurai J J 1987 *Advanced Quantum Mechanics* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company)
- [38] Mohapatra R N and Pati J C 1975 *Phys. Rev. D* **11** 566
- [39] Pleitez V and Tonasse M D 1993 *Phys. Rev. D* **48** 2353
- [40] Wolfenstein L 1978 *Phys. Rev. D* **17** 2369; *ibid* 1979 **20** 2634
Mikheyev S P and Smirnov A Yu 1986 *Nuovo Cimento C* **9** 17
- [41] Guzzo M M, de Holanda P C and Reggiani N 2003 *Phys. Lett. B* **569** 45
Gonzalez-Garcia M C *et al.* *Phys. Rev. D* **58** 033004
- [42] Ayala A, D’Olivo J C and Torres M 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **59** **RC** 111901